

LABOUR 1s. **MONTHLY**

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

K. ZILLIACUS, M.P.

ON

APPEASEMENT

SEPTEMBER, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

	Page
Notes of the Month: <i>The New "Co-Prosperity"</i>	
<i>Sphere</i> by R. P. D.	257
Debunking the Excuse for War	
by K. ZILLIACUS, M.P. ...	267
Britain's Economic Plight by J. R. CAMPBELL ...	270
Trade Union Education by DOUGLAS GARMAN ...	275
War Comes to Malaya by H. B. LIM	280
<i>100 Years Ago—</i>	
Marx on Dictatorship	284
<i>Book Reviews—</i>	
The Defence of Materialism by G. V. Plekhanov:	
C. P. Dutt ...	285
One Thousand Americans by George Seldes:	
D. N. Pritt ...	286
Lehren Deutscher Geschichte by A. Norden:	
J. W. ...	288

TWO PAPER DOLLARS . . .

Out of the envelope with a South Shields postmark slipped two crumpled dollar notes. Here is their history just as it was told to us.

"Please find enclosed two dollar notes, which, if still negotiable, I wish you to use in your development fund. The dollars originally belonged to my sister's stepson. He was a seafarer, third engineer on a tramp steamer. While on duty at sea in the engineroom, a steam pipe burst and he was badly scalded. He died from his injuries and was buried on the Azores. That happened in 1933. My sister could not use the notes, so they were laid away in a drawer and have been there ever since. While reading the July Monthly I saw where an American reader sent you two paper dollars and you said you could use them. That brought to my mind the two paper dollars lying in the drawer. I asked my sister if she was agreeable to my sending you them. Without hesitation she agreed.

"I think the stepson would have agreed too. He was one of the unfortunate young fellows who entered manhood when the depression arrived after World War I. He knew all about dole queues and looking for work which did not exist; he had a few years of it. Then he went to sea. He would be about 30 when he died.

"May the Monthly long continue its work on behalf of international labour and socialism. This 5s postal order is from me."

JAMES CLEMENT (South Shields).

An old age pensioner, James Clement is a bricklayer who holds his union's medal, a free card and a certificate for 50 years' unbroken membership on which is written "You built better than you knew."

OUT ON THE PRAIRIES

A Canadian reader writes to tell us about a Labour Monthly "study

(Continued on page iv. of cover)

The New “Co-Prosperity” Sphere

ON July 28 three events cast a lurid light on the present situation. At Ludwigshaven, the headquarters of the giant German Chemical Trust, which with the Steel Trust had placed Hitler in power and let loose the last war, a ghastly explosion, resulting in thousands of killed and wounded, revealed that these works, which had produced the explosives and poison gas and V 2s in the last war, were once again in full blast at 90 per cent. of wartime capacity. All the Anglo-American wartime bombing, which had wrought such havoc in the surrounding working class quarters, had left unscathed the works and productive capacity of the Chemical Trust, whose capital and world commercial connections have been proved to be closely interlocked with the parallel American and British Chemical Trusts. On the same day, July 28, the war criminal directors of the German Chemical Trust were acquitted of the charge of war aggression by an American Tribunal at Nuremburg, after their defence counsel, according to the prosecution's own statement, had had access to the Trust's files in order to destroy incriminating documents. On the same day, July 28, the National Council of Labour in Britain published a sabre-rattling call for war, comparing the situation to 1938—only this time on the side of Germany against the Socialist Soviet Union :

Once again a totalitarian flood threatens to engulf the last island of liberty in Eastern Europe.

The obligations resting on the West today are as compelling as they were in 1938 . . .

Berlin is a symbol of the conflict between two systems of belief and action. Any show of weakness by the West would be a fatal shock to world confidence.

Further discussion cannot begin until the Russian blockade is lifted. The Council expresses its appreciation of the courage shown by the people of Berlin.

Three facets of a single policy. Maintenance of the old industrial war machine which armed Hitler. Condonation of the Nazi industrialists who let loose war. Frenzied calls for a new war to continue the Nazi anti-Soviet crusade. This is a measure of some of the developments which have taken place in the Western world in the three years since victory over Hitler.

Negotiations in Moscow

But on July 28 a fourth item of news revealed another aspect of the picture. On July 28 it was announced that the Western Powers, after prolonged hesitations and cross-currents, after frenzied calls from the war camp for an immediate show-down, for an ultimatum or warlike measures, had decided to send envoys to Moscow for personal

conversations with Molotov and Stalin concerning the crisis in Berlin and Germany. According to the *Daily Telegraph* of the preceding day, July 27 :

Any suggestion of a personal approach to M. Stalin or M. Molotov appears to have come from the Americans, but was not favoured by Britain or France. The possibility of such action cannot be entirely disregarded, but it is thought to be increasingly unlikely.

Within a day the “unlikely” course of action, stated to be “not favoured by Britain or France,” had been decided. The timing of the National Council of Labour’s hysterical war call proved unfortunate. On the same day that the bellicose National Council of Labour was fiercely demanding that “further discussion cannot begin until the Russian blockade is lifted,” the decision had just been taken that “further discussion” should begin without any such ultimatory conditions. The universal popular relief with which this announcement of negotiations was received revealed the depth of the desire of the peoples of all countries for a settlement and for the resumption of Four Power co-operation. But it would be premature to assume that the sending of a mission to Moscow yet meant any change in the policy which had disrupted Four Power co-operation, banged the door on and arbitrarily suspended the Conference of Foreign Ministers in London last December, and proceeded in June to adopt the London Conference illegal decisions for setting up a West German State which precipitated the Berlin crisis. That policy has still to be changed.

“A Cardinal Error”

The Western Powers had been compelled to recognise the untenable position in which they had landed themselves by their ill-calculated precipitation of the establishment of a West German State without foreseeing the full character of the Berlin crisis they were thereby provoking. As Walter Lippmann, the unsparing critic of the senseless megalomaniac Churchill-Marshall-Bevin policy, correctly wrote, the Berlin crisis was the “inevitable result” of the London Conference decision on Germany—“a cardinal error of American and British policy,” in consequence of which “the Russians have won a cheap and easy diplomatic victory by seizing and exploiting the opportunity which we so unwisely and unnecessarily provided for them.” The noisy calls of the *Observer* and Right Wing Labour school for war and a last ditch stand over Berlin were empty and valueless in face of the actual situation confronting the General Staffs and Governments. The French Government had just fallen because of the London Conference decisions, which had only been forced through an unwilling parliament by a bare majority of eight votes; and neither the French nor the British peoples were prepared to go to war, within three years of the last war for defeating Hitler, in order to set up a West German State under the same monopolist forces which had placed Hitler in power.

“ A Bitter Choice ”

In a gloomy article on July 24, under the title “ A Bitter Choice,” the *Economist* commented :

Events in the last week have only served to underline the strength of the Russian position in Berlin. The Soviet rejection of the Allied notes leaves the Western Powers, not the Russians, in a quandary over what to do next. The Russian offer to feed the Western sectors of Berlin in exchange for Eastern currency weakens the Allied accusation that it is Russia's aim to starve out 2½ million Germans. . . . It is no use minimising the Russian advantage. . . . The air-lift cannot be maintained indefinitely on the present scale. . . . At some point the air-lift will cease to be enough to hold the position.

The only practical alternatives seen by this editorial writer were war or withdrawal (since the only real alternative of a return to Four Power co-operation and wartime agreements could not of course be envisaged by these disciples of the Western Bloc and the Marshall Plan); and both looked equally unpromising. The unfavourable conditions for war at this point over this issue were recognised :

Such a war might not be either quickly or easily won. Too much reliance can easily be put in the atomic bomb. . . . If the quarrel over Berlin is to be resolved by force, the responsibility for firing the first shot may lie with the West. This is one more illustration of the tactical strength of the Russian position.

And the conclusion of this sapient commentator ?

It is, then, a very bitter choice that the Western peoples may have to make. It is not the purpose of this article to say what the choice should be. *Frankly, we do not know.* The Western countries have blundered into this crisis and are only just beginning to realise the intensity of the dilemma with which they are faced. They have every right to be furiously angry with the so-called leaders who put them there.

It was in this situation, not through any change of heart, but under the merciless pressure of this unresolved dilemma, caused by their own ill-judged policies, that the Western statesmen, after having repeatedly banged the table and declared that they would never, never negotiate until the Russians had retreated from their stand on Berlin, decided to temporise and send a mission to Moscow to explore the ground.

On Guard

At the time of writing no official statement has yet been made on the outcome of the Moscow conversations. It would therefore be out of place to prejudge this outcome on the basis of speculative comment which has appeared. By the time these lines are read it may be assumed that fuller announcements will have clarified the position. There is no doubt that these talks represent the decisive turning point of the post-war international situation. They have opened out the choice between two paths. Either the return to Four Power co-operation, the fulfilment of wartime agreements, the establishment of a united democratic Germany and withdrawal of occupation armies, and renewal of co-operation through the United Nations. This is the path of peace and economic recovery. The alternative path is

the path of the final rupture of Four Power co-operation, the partitioning of Germany and Europe, and the establishment of a Western German State as the pivot of a reactionary Western Bloc, with all the disastrous economic consequences that this will entail, and paving the way for a new war. We may certainly hope for the former outcome. But we cannot be blind to the hostile influences that are at work, or to the intensified propaganda activity of the war camp, which openly seeks to wreck the Moscow talks and denounces the menace of what they call a "sell-out", i.e. an agreement between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union. The fight for peace cannot afford to be lulled or relaxed by the mere fact of talks in Moscow, so long as the policy responsible for the crisis continues unchanged.

1939 and 1948

Nor can we forget the lesson of the spurious Western-Soviet negotiations of the summer of 1939 which preceded the war. Public opinion was lulled by the negotiations into trusting Chamberlain and believing that the Alliance was round the corner, when in reality no serious instructions were sent to reach a concrete agreement, and the hour-glass was running out for war. The parallel might even be pursued by the curious to the detail of sending a minor Foreign Office clerk for such a responsible negotiation involving the whole future of peace or war. In fact, however, the conditions of the problem are basically different today from 1939. But it remains true that public opinion needs to be mobilised and vigilant and to intensify the fight in order to reverse the present disastrous reactionary Western Bloc anti-Soviet policy—which is in essence nothing but the continuation of the old Munichite policy—and to ensure return to Four Power co-operation and an agreement for a united democratic Germany as the indispensable path of recovery and peace.

Portents of Economic Crisis

The cost of the present policy is revealing itself, not only in Germany, but also in Britain, France and all the Marshall countries. Economic difficulties are growing daily more critical in all the Marshall countries, and also in the United States. In France the desperate economic situation is undermining the existing régime, and has already given rise to the emergency economic dictatorship plans of Reynaud. In Italy unemployment is rising. In Western Germany the ruthless operation of the currency reform, wiping out small savings and cutting purchasing power, has been followed by rising prices which have led to mass demonstrations of discontent. In Britain, when the Trades Union Congress meets, the main issue will be Wages, Prices and Profits. The facts are unmistakable. Real wages have fallen; even according to the official figures, the past twelve months show a rise in retail prices by ten per cent, as against a rise of wage rates by six per cent. Profits have continued to soar; in his mid-July report on the economic situation Cripps declared that "profits declared

this year have been considerably higher than in the past twelve months”, and that, despite the appeal for voluntary limitation of dividends, one quarter of the companies declaring results in the previous three months had increased their dividends. Unions representing five million workers are demanding increases of wages. Withdrawals from savings are exceeding new savings. Stocks are beginning to accumulate in the shops; and successive withdrawals of controls and extensions of coupons are not succeeding in disposing of them in face of the contraction of purchasing power. At the same time the adverse balance of trade for the first half of the year exceeds the high level of the first half of last year. Such is the working out of the Cripps Plan, which is crippling economic recovery and worsening the condition of the workers. But the Cripps Plan is only the form of the Marshall Plan for Britain, just as the Reynaud Plan is the form of the Marshall Plan for France. Public opinion is beginning to awaken to the menace of war which is implicit in the Marshall Plan. But the menace of war is still often seen as the negative side of a plan for economic recovery. It is necessary to see no less clearly the menace of economic catastrophe which the Marshall Plan is bringing.

The New “Co-Prosperity” Sphere

When Japan was engaged in extending its empire in the Far East and South Eastern Asia, the Japanese imperialists worked out a new technique and language for imperialist expansion. They were not engaged in building up a Japanese Empire. Not at all. That was only a cruel misunderstanding. They were building up a “Co-Prosperity Sphere of Eastern Asia”. There were no “wars” taking place in the sphere. There were only “incidents”. The Japanese invaders were not bringing fire and sword against peoples struggling for their freedom. They were only engaged in “police operations” against “bandits”. This flowery terminology used to arouse mocking laughter then. The laugh is the other way round now. We are too familiar with this language now from every organ of the kept press and from every Minister on the platform or High Commissioner in Asia. The Anglo-American imperialists have not only picked up their lessons from the Nazis and learned from Goebbels to prate about the Iron Curtain and the Bolshevik Hordes. They have also picked up their lessons from the Japanese exponents who are today being so zealously fostered under the loving care of MacArthur. There is no New American Empire. There is only a Marshall Recovery Area of Europe and Asia. There are no “wars” in Greece or China or Malaya. There are only “police operations” against “bandits” and “Communist criminals”. From Chiang Kai-shek to Creech Jones, and from Marshall to MacDonald the language is the same—and the language is the language of Tojo and Hirohito. But Britain is no independent agent in the new Co-Prosperity Sphere. In discussing the economic and political problems of Britain, we need to adapt our language to the new polite terminology. Britain is now one of the eighteen local

territories (Finletter's territory) of the Marshall Recovery Area in Europe (Hoffmann's area), suffering a common fate, and swept by currents governed from elsewhere.

Japan's Five Year Plan

When we speak of Japan today, it is necessary to recognise the pivotal role of Japan, alongside Western Germany, in the full range of the Marshall Plan. Nor is this significance only strategic. Japan and Western Germany represent the two favoured regions of direct domination and financial penetration, restriction of democratic development, monopolist concentration and cheap labour to serve as the main industrial bases and instruments for the American economic offensive against the older capitalist powers. Just as Western Germany receives the main dollar appropriations in Europe, so Japan is brought under the same fostering hand for Asia. Recently the new Five Year Economic Rehabilitation Plan for Japan was published, with, it is stated, official American approval. Britain's steel industry is restricted by the refusal of scrap which lies unused in Western Germany. But Japan's steel industry is to be expanded to 141 per cent. of the 1930-34 level by 1952. Japan's textile exports are to be expanded to £360 million by 1952. All this development is to be financed by American capital.

The success of the plan depends entirely upon securing foreign capital. It is estimated that \$1,630m. will be required. Private loans are not being counted on, and it is hoped that the whole of the capital required will be made available to Japan by the United States Government. (*Times*, 24.7.48).

The power of this battering ram against British trade interests in Eastern Asia has already made itself felt. As the British monopolists are continuously squeezed out of their former Empire preserves by American penetration, skilfully utilising the provisions of the old Loan Agreement, the Havana Trade Charter and the new Anglo-American Economic Agreement imposed as the price of Marshall aid, they are simultaneously lectured by their American rivals and told to recognise that their future henceforth is no longer as a World Power, but as one of the local territories of the Western European economic group under American control.

Western European Economic Mirage

A Hoffmann "Master Plan" is announced for Western Europe. The British monopolists are accused by the American pacemakers of slowness and reluctance to merge their identity in a Western European economic federation. The reluctance is not surprising, any more than the expressions of alarm from the sections of Dominions capitalism associated with British interests. The old Lion of Empire, however much it may once have dreamed of dominating Western Europe, is less eager to have its claws pared in order to be turned into a lamb in the Western European sheep pen. The fallacy of "Western European economic unity", however attractive to ideological

innocents, is too obvious from a business point of view. The Western European countries are not economically complementary; they are competitive capitalist industrial exporting and imperialist countries. They suffer from kindred problems of the deficit in the balance of trade and the dollar deficit, and are engaged in a competitive exports drive alongside parallel restriction of imports. Their sickness is the common sickness of the declining Western European imperialism. Before the war one-fourth of the imports of the Western European countries now grouped under the Marshall Plan was not paid for by the export of goods. This represented their parasitic imperialist economy, which is today mortally stricken. No Marshall Plan of temporary unpaid dollar imports can cure this disease. The cure requires a radical reconstruction of economy to end the old imperialist basis. Instead, with a temporary artificial sustenance of Marshall aid, these Governments are engaged in a desperate attempt to restore, maintain and extend the basis of colonial exploitation as the supposed only cure. This effort, conducted against the resistance of the colonial peoples now awakened to the struggle for freedom, and necessitating in consequence a ceaseless drain of colonial wars, overstraining the already weakened economy of the declining imperialist centres, only intensifies the disease.

“Something New Out of Africa”?

So the dream of “Western European economic unity” finally takes on its true colours and becomes more and more openly, in the explicit declaration of its own adherents, the dream of the intensified exploitation of Africa and the colonies as the indispensable basis of “Western European Union”. The imperialist basis of “United Europe” is laid bare. As the Labour Party Executive declared in the spring of this year:

It is fully recognised that Western Europe cannot live by itself as an independent economic unit . . . A real reduction in our dependence on American supplies depends above all on developing the vast resources of the African continent.

(“The Labour Party’s Plan for Western Europe”).

Mosley and the Tories use exactly the same language. And American Big Capital, through the mouth of Dulles, Republican adviser on foreign policy, presses the same solution—under American control.

Mr. Dulles has for some time been advocating United States financial and technical aid in developing the African continent. Africa, he has said, could make Western Europe completely independent of Eastern European resources, and that should be the aim. (*Sunday Times*, 4.7.48).

Colonial Mirage

But the supposed solution of Western Europe’s economic dilemmas on the backs of the exploited Africans is no less a mirage. The long-term schemes of development require large capital outlay which further strains the weakened European economies without immediate return. The impoverishment of the African peoples under colonial exploitation is so extreme that their desperate economic

situation and food shortage is far more critical than that of Europe. At the same time the African peoples, from the Gold Coast to Uganda, are awakening to their struggle for freedom, alongside their brothers of South East Asia. Thus the colonial policy of Western European imperialism, presented to the masses in glowing terms of Ground Nuts from Heaven, reveals itself in practice as involving ever more barbarous suppression and ruinous colonial wars. The Labour Government of "democratic socialism" and "Western Christian humanitarian ideals" reveals itself in practice as the bloodthirsty Government of colonial suppression from the Gold Coast to Malaya, where the Head Hunters of Borneo and their blowpipes and poison darts are the chosen agents of "Western civilisation".

American Economic Madhouse

But what of the American centre of the new "Co-Prosperity Sphere", on which every part depends? The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse Tung, has aptly said:

The American reactionary has a heavy burden. He must sustain the reactionaries of the entire world. And if he cannot sustain them the house will fall down. It is a house with one pillar.

Today the one pillar is displaying considerable cracks at the foundations. At shortening intervals President Truman proclaims his tale of woe at the headlong advance of inflation and warns of imminent collapse unless drastic measures of control are undertaken. The drastic measures of control are no less regularly refused by Congress; when did capitalism even want to physic itself at the height of a boom? President Truman, having failed of every other historical role, evidently hopes, as he goes down to defeat, to be remembered as Cassandra.

Warning Signals

The facts are unmistakable. Profits of the leading corporations in 1947, according to the Wall Street Journal, exceeded the previous year by 48 per cent.; profits for the second quarter of 1948, according to the same journal, have further advanced on the preceding year by 26 per cent. Stock Exchange quotations have this summer exceeded the previous peak of 1929 which preceded the crash. Prices, according to the index figure of the cost of living, which stood at 129 per cent. of pre-war at the end of the war, in August, 1945, reached 171 per cent. by June, 1948; food prices soared to 214 per cent. Wage increases, totalling 10 per cent. in 1947, and 7 per cent. in the first half of 1948, have fallen heavily behind the rise in prices. Consumers' purchasing power, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin, has suffered a net reduction, taking into account the rise in prices; small savings are being used up; one quarter of consumers spent more than their incomes, and the number of holders of savings bonds went down by three millions. On the other hand, industrial saving and reserves and expenditure on new equipment are advancing at an accelerating

pace; expenditure on new capital equipment in 1947 reached the staggering total of 16 billion dollars or £4,000 million (yet Cripps, with his drastic cuts of the modest programmes of capital equipment in Britain, still hopes to compete by overworking cheap labour on old machinery); and a higher total is expected for 1948.

What is happening is essentially that business, by raising prices faster than consumers' incomes, is forcing consumers to sacrifice savings in order than business savings may increase. And business is using these savings to prepare to sell more to consumers than consumers are now able to buy. (*New York Nation*, 17.7.48).

“Boom and Bust”

Where is the increased product to go, in face of the decline in the home market? Exports in the first five months of 1948 have shown a decline by 13.5 per cent. from the previous year. It may be worth noting that the index of the volume of industrial production shows for the first time signs of a decline from the peak of 194 per cent. of pre-war in February of this year to 192 per cent. in June. The “optimists” place their hopes in E.R.P. and intensified rearmament expenditure, possibly culminating in war, to postpone the otherwise inevitable crash.

Thanks to the national preparedness programme, U.S. business prosperity may well be maintained for several years longer. Without these factors domestic business might have sagged even this year.

(Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the President's Committee of Economic Advisers).

But the consequent budget deficit, as Truman has pointed out, is accelerating the inflationary drive. The Hitler methods of rearmament economy presuppose the Hitler régime of controls; and it is precisely against any régime of controls or increased taxation that American big business revolts. Short of drastic political changes of a military-fascist type presupposing war, or the onset of war itself, the present signs would point rather to the approach of the classic type of economic crash. In the words of Marriner Eccles, the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in his evidence to the Senate Banking Committee on August 1:

This country is certainly going to have a bust.

T.U.C. Responsibilities

The Trades Union Congress, when it meets in the beginning of September, will have the responsibility to face these wider aspects of the world economic situation which will have their decisive bearing on the economic future in this country. The present economic destiny of this country is tied to the American economic destiny. The Marshall-Bevin-Cripps policy, which is restricting the industrial productive development and re-equipment of this country, and restricting trade development with the Eastern European countries and the Dominions, in the interests of the bankrupt economic basis of the Marshall Plan and of a crazy war policy, is leading this country to

economic catastrophe. The first consequences are already felt in the worsened conditions of the working people, and are reflected in the universal demands for increased wages to meet the rise in prices. Demands for wage increases are at this moment lodged or pending on behalf of the majority of trade unionists affiliated to the T.U.C., at the same time as the T.U.C. still stands officially committed to the wage-freeze policy of the Government. This contradiction cannot continue indefinitely. The fight for wage increases is hamstrung at the start if the premisses of the Government's economic policy are accepted.

The Fight for a Working Class Policy

The significance of the Hoffman-Cripps appointment of an Anglo-American Joint Committee of employers and trade union leaders is not to transfer the American methods of superior technical equipment to this country (the Cripps capital cuts rule this out), but to transfer the American methods of capital-labour relations to break the resistance of progressive trade unionism in this country—to transfer the methods of the Taft-Hartley Act. At this moment when the Labour Government is acting as the open spokesmen of the policies of big business in this country and America, the Trades Union Congress, as the major body of the organised workers of this country, has the responsibility to speak for the working class. The fight for increased wages can only be fought and won in opposition to the wage-freeze policy of the Government. It can only be fought and won as an integral part of the fight to reverse the existing economic policy of the Government which finds expression in the Cripps Plan, the Marshall-Hoffman Plan and the anti-Soviet war crusade. It has been said that the fight for peace, to end the ruinous war policy which is the most important immediate factor in the country's economic difficulties, is at the same time the fight for living standards. The reverse is also true. The fight for living standards, success in which becomes the most powerful driving force to compel a change in economic policy, and therefore in the whole political line, is at the same time the fight for peace and for the recovery of Britain.

August 16, 1948.

R. P. D.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 12s. Postage paid. Abroad, 13s. from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, or from all leading wholesalers and bookshops.

DEBUNKING THE EXCUSE FOR WAR

By K. ZILLIACUS, M.P.

I HAVE asked the LABOUR MONTHLY whether they will publish a discussion on the moral and intellectual foundation of the plea of the warmongers today. I believe it is a matter of urgent public interest that the argument I put forward below should be made public. I bitterly regret that I was prevented by illness from putting this plea in the House during the debate on Germany.

It is a striking commentary on the depths to which we have sunk that it would be impossible to get this article published in either of the allegedly Socialist weeklies, the *Tribune* or the *New Statesman*. The *Tribune* is becoming nothing more nor less than an advocate of the third World War as a tool and agent of American capitalism against the European working class and the Soviet Union, in the name of anti-communism.

Even the *New Statesman* has wobbled so far along the path of watered-down Bevinism in the name of Western Union, the Third Force and anti-Communist fanaticism, that it has for all practical purposes joined those who are conditioning the minds of the British people for a war on the side of the United States against the Soviet Union, and no longer contains articles making a root and branch attack on this position.

I wish to debunk once for all the "anti-appeasement" argument habitually invoked as an excuse for trying to win the peace after the second world war by going back to the balance of power that landed us in the first world war, and has invariably lost the peace throughout history. They would do so, too, in conditions where we are the weaker partner on our side of the balance and therefore have to go to war and be destroyed in the process for purposes determined not in London but in Washington, in a world where war itself has become so destructive and the issues at stake are so vast and vague that we should not know what we are fighting about nor how to end the war, and it could only end, as Walter Lippman points out in his book on "*The Cold War*", by merging into a general civil war.

I was one of the half-dozen officials of the League of Nations Secretariat who fought appeasement from the very beginning with all we had at the imminent risk of our jobs. I therefore know what I am talking about.

To begin with, appeasement is a normal and necessary part of diplomatic intercourse, explicitly provided for in both the Covenant and the United Nations Charter. Its dictionary meaning is "Allaying, bringing to peace, or composing those at strife or in conflict." In international relations it means negotiation, conciliation, mediation, "good offices", compromise reached through negotiations, in a word

a large part of normal intercourse between independent States. The Tories prostituted the word and made it stink, to cover bargains with the aggressor at the expense of his victim and in disregard of the Covenant.

We who opposed appeasement were called warmongers and accused of wanting a preventive war. That was a perfectly true charge. We had worked with might and main to mobilise the threat and use of force against the Covenant-breaking aggressors; primarily economic force, for that was what the Covenant called for in the first place, but if this led to open war we were prepared to take the risk. Why?

For three reasons: (a) In order to uphold the Covenant of the League and the rule of law within the limits of the physically possible; philosophers agree that there is no such thing as a duty to perform the physically impossible. Thus in the case of Japan we did not seek to secure the unflinching application of the Covenant but to push the British Government, as the leading member of the League, to seek agreement with the United States for joint action. On the other hand we did try to get drastic action to nip the Nazi rearmament in the bud in 1933 and to close the Suez Canal and apply the oil embargo against Mussolini in 1935.

(b) We persevered in this course because with the American help that could be obtained if the Government had gone all out to get it instead of deliberately sabotaging the League to death, overwhelming superiority of force could have been mobilised against Japan in 1931 and 1932; to stop Hitler rearming in 1933; to smash Mussolini's aggression against Abyssinia in 1935; even to support the Spanish Republic by supplying it with arms and volunteers under Article 10 of the Covenant.

(c) We wanted to take the risk of applying the Covenant, not only because it was possible on any of those occasions to mobilise an overwhelming superiority of force against the aggressor in and through the League, but also because we were convinced that Fascism, being capitalist counter-revolution, was by its very nature unappeasable and unfit to live. The Fascist régimes could not fulfil their promises to their peoples without taking the land from the landlords and taking over big business and banking for the benefit of the people. Being Fascists and not Socialists the gangsters in power in Germany and Italy were subsidised by big business and turned their social demagoguery into warmongering, war preparations and steadily swelling aggressions. Those régimes could not live on any other terms and therefore had to be smashed before they were strong enough to plunge the world into a second world war.

I am proud that I was one of the few who reasoned clearly on those grave issues and took my corner with a full sense of my responsibility. But compare the situation today:

(a) The Charter is based on a different principle to that of the Covenant, namely on the principle that for the great powers who are the permanent members of its Security Council to fall out and fight

would be a greater evil than that they should compose any or all of their differences by compromise, negotiation and the other peaceful means provided by the Charter. The Charter, therefore, not only does not impose any obligation upon any great power to fight the others, but on the contrary pledges them to settle all their differences by peaceful means and in no circumstances to resort to force or the threat of force as a means of settlement. That was why the Secretary General of the United Nations in his first report to the General Assembly pointed out that "The fact that the Charter gave the right of veto to each of the permanent members of the Security Council imposes upon them an obligation to seek agreement amongst themselves . . . and not abandon their efforts until such agreement has been reached."

That is, the Charter pledges the permanent members of the Security Council to go on appeasing each other until they reach agreement. This pledge, of course, does not exclude the right to disagree or even to drift into a deadlock. But it does impose the obligation to seek the way out of disagreements and deadlocks always by peaceful means and never by force.

It is true that Article 51 of the Charter says that nothing in it "shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." This as it stands merely states the obvious, and is followed up by underlining that measures taken by member States in the exercise of their right of self defence must be immediately reported to the Security Council "and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter."

This provision was inserted to allow of the conclusion of defence pacts by member States against Germany, which is not a member of the United Nations. The alliances concluded in Eastern Europe are all directed against Germany or any State fighting in association with Germany and are therefore not formally an infringement of this obligation, although they may be held to stretch its spirit. But the Five-Power Western agreement and the Anglo-American defence arrangements are a formal violation of the Charter and therefore legally null and void under Article 103 of that instrument, because they apply against not only Germany but "any other European State" and are in fact of course an Anglo-American-West European alliance directed from Washington and preparing to use force and the threat of force in their relations with the Soviet Union in open violation of Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter.

The Labour Government have prostituted the word "defence" as shamelessly to justify tearing up the Charter and going back to the balance of power as the Tories prostituted the equally legitimate concept of "appeasement" as an excuse for conniving at Fascist aggression.

(b) There is no possibility of mobilising an overwhelming superiority of force against the Soviet Union today, so that if the United States does go to war or Mr. Bevin tries to save his face at the expense of the blood of our people and the lives of our children in Berlin or Greece or anywhere else, they will start a third world war.

(c) Finally, whereas Fascism, being the extreme form of capitalist counter-revolution, could not live at peace and could not evolve into anything decent, Communism, being the extreme form of social revolution, is actually building a new society in Russia and elsewhere, wants and needs peace, and, given international peace and friendship, is capable of evolving towards democracy and liberty.

That is why I say we must oppose and resist by any and every means any resort to war on any pretext over Berlin (or Greece, or Korea). Some papers have suggested that we must not withdraw because to do so would mean Communists winning elections in France and Italy as well as in Western Germany. I say that is a lesser evil than a world war. War is justified only in self-defence or as part of collective action to uphold the obligations of the Charter pursuant to a decision by the Security Council. Neither arises in the case of Berlin (or Greece, or Korea).

So let us hear no more about anti-appeasement and Munich from Tories who are as anxious to land us in the third world war in their insane desire to fight Communism as they actually did land us in the second world war because they put their class solidarity with Fascism before the interests of the country and of civilisation. And that goes for crypto-Tories in the Labour Party also.

BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC PLIGHT

By J. R. CAMPBELL

THE economic results for the first six months of 1948 are now being published and enable us to see how far the Government is approaching its targets outlined in the Economic Survey for 1948. Those results have, of course, to be understood in the light of Britain's changed position in the world, which is not something which has emerged in the last few years, but has been evident since the end of the first World War. The taking of one-sixth of the world out of the orbit of capitalist economy by the Russian revolution, the growth of the national liberation movement in the colonies, with its sharp challenge to British imperialism, the gradual shifting of the centre of capitalist economic power from Europe to the U.S.A., all undermined the position in Britain and presented it, even before the second World War, with a vast problem of adaptation. The background must ever be in mind in considering the degree of success or otherwise of the Government's present policy.

No real attempt was made to understand this situation in the

first two years of the Government's life. It was expected that the U.S. loan would enable Britain to muddle through to 1949 or 1950, by which time a vast development of export trade would render the country independent of further foreign assistance. When the loan ran out much quicker than expected, there was a sharp and sudden improvisation of policy to meet this new situation. Frantic appeals were issued for Marshall Aid and attempts were made to arrive at a domestic programme of a purely capitalist character. The Government argued that too much was being attempted in relation to labour and raw materials and that there would require to be a pruning down of expenditure so that the various projects in hand would be matched with available resources. The most obvious thing to do was to cut expenditure on the armed forces. This, however, was done only to a trifling extent.

The main cuts were on capital expenditure and on the consumption of imported foodstuffs and materials. These cuts were matched on the financial side by attempts to restrict wage advances and to cut working-class purchasing power by increased taxation. A small increase was made in the profits tax and employers were asked to reduce prices and profits wherever possible. All these things, it was argued, would pep up the economic system and contribute greatly to the export drive. The targets for this drive were fixed at 50 per cent. above 1938 by the end of 1948 and at 40 per cent. by the middle of the year. It was estimated that over the year as a whole there would be a deficit on Britain's balance of payments of £250 million for the whole year.

Exports in the first half of the year were 30 per cent. above 1938 and 1946, and in July 45 per cent. above, and the target of 50 per cent. is therefore likely to be reached by the end of the year. Alas, import prices have gone up faster than export prices, and so the deficit in Britain's balance of payments is running at the rate of £300 million instead of the £250 million planned.

In order to understand how serious this is, one must take into account the starvation level of present day imports which are only 4/5ths in volume of those in 1938. They were characterised in the Economic Survey of 1938 as being "no more than sufficient to keep the nation in health and working efficiency" and as being "the minimum required to maintain a high level of employment in 1948". This means that we are going along on minimum stocks of food and materials, living from hand to mouth. Please note that even this low level of imports is not being paid for by existing exports (visible and invisible), but requires also £325 million per year from Marshall aid. The tremendous gap to be filled should be evident to everyone. We have a long way to travel before the British people as a whole consumes the quality and the quantity of food that it did in 1938.

Government spokesmen are of course trying to minimise the position by telling us that the terms of trade (i.e., the price we get for

our exports as compared with the price we pay for our imports) have turned against us temporarily and may later turn back in our favour. An ever increasing number of informed people are rejecting this soothing interpretation. On the contrary they point out that the real weakness of our position in the 1930s was concealed from us because of the abnormal fall in the price of foreign produced food and raw materials as compared with the price of manufactured goods. In effect the great imperialist countries transferred a large part of the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of primary producers—above all the colonial peoples. All that has happened in recent years is that the prices of foodstuffs and raw materials are climbing back to the position they were in in relation to manufactured goods prior to the outbreak of the world economic crisis of 1929. Politically, the position of the colonial peoples has improved greatly since 1929, and any attempt to push down the prices of their products will meet with tremendous resistance. So Britain must resign itself to the fact that the terms of trade are likely to stay pretty much where they are. The real seriousness of the position is at last being revealed.

It is probable on the basis that to attain our pre-war level of imports we shall need exports at least 90 per cent. in volume above pre-war. Even if there were no U.S. slump in the offing, it is extremely unlikely that any such figure can be achieved. It is clear that any sensible long run programme for Great Britain involves the substitution of home production for imports on a much larger scale than anyone has hitherto deemed possible. It is true that we shall always be dependent on foreign trade to a greater extent than most other countries, but the present exaggerated dependence is based not on an all-round scarcity of local resources, or on a rational division of labour between countries, but on the imperialist exploitation of the colonies and dominions which is now being undermined.

How far British industry has advanced since the end of the war and how far it is capable of adapting itself to the tremendous new tasks which are confronting it, necessitates an examination of the question of production, manpower and capital development. The total volume of production in Britain in the first months of 1948 has been estimated by the Government as being 11 per cent. up on 1938 and 20 per cent. up on 1947. However, as there has been a 7 per cent. increase in the number of workers employed in the industries covered by the interim index of industrial production, these figures show that the increase in production per head is only slightly larger than before the war. It is estimated that before the war the increase in production per worker in British industries and services was $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per head per year, and it was confidently predicted by Mr. Kaldor in his appendix to the Beveridge book on full employment that it would reach 13 per cent. above pre-war by 1948. In the light of this the actual increase in productivity (even allowing for reductions in hours) is disappointing. However, it should be noted that steel production will exceed the Government target of 14 million ingot tons and this

itself is likely to raise general national production to a higher level in the year as a whole, than was forecast in the Economic Survey. Nevertheless when the need for higher exports and for a greater tempo of re-equipment is understood the over-optimistic conclusions which Labour spokesmen are drawing from the production increase are totally unjustified.

Further the figures in mid-year show quite clearly that the Government will not get the labour allocation best calculated to achieve its targets. The labour allocation outlined in the economic survey for 1938 assumed that the development of distribution and consumer services could be restricted. Nothing like this has taken place. All of those services have already reached a higher level of manpower than laid down in their target for the end of 1948 and the tendency is for them to increase. On the other hand both the mining industry and the textile industry on whom a heavy export burden was laid will fail to reach their manpower target for the year and textiles will also certainly fail to reach their export target as well. It will hardly benefit the British people if the manpower target in hotels and restaurants is exceeded and the manpower and export targets in vital industries such as textiles are missed by a very wide margin.

It is impossible to gauge from any statistics available during the half year the exact extent to which British industry is being modernised. The data available are decidedly mixed. In agriculture the position is reasonably healthy. Production of agricultural machinery was running at the rate of £64 million per year in the first quarter of 1948, of which £22 million was for export. Exports are scheduled to increase in the remaining three-quarters of the year, but production is increasing also and well over £40 million of machinery will be available for home use. This compares with the estimate of the National Farmers' Union that the industry could absorb £21 million per year exclusive of milking machines. It compares with £33 million absorbed by the home industry in 1947.

On the other hand the results in the textile industry were really wretched. In March textile machinery (other than hosiery machinery) was being produced for the home market at the rate of £20 million per annum, which compares with £13 million in the year 1947. One has to remember, however, that this covers all kinds of machinery and accessories for the cotton, woollen, rayon, jute, linen and lace industries. It will be remembered that it was estimated that for the cotton industry alone £28 million of new spinning machinery and £19 million of new weaving machines were needed in the next few years. For the woollen industry the figure was £28 million.

In the mining machinery industry the Government laid down a target of 1,400 coal cutters, 250 power loaders and 4,700 conveyors for the entire year. 632 coal cutters have been produced in the first six months of 1948, so this target should be achieved with a little extra effort. Only 2,005 conveyors have been produced and the achievement of the target is doubtful indeed. The number of power loaders

produced is 67 in the first six months, and unless the manufacturers have some additional productive capacity up their sleeve the exceedingly low target for this essential machine will not be reached. The production of this machine is one of the most disgraceful features in British engineering history. It was being produced at the rate of 8 per month as far back as 1944. Yet production has only increased to the rate of 11 per month in the first six months of this year.

It is, of course, true that the overall volume of re-equipment is greater than in a normal pre-war year, but when one remembers the backlog of replacements as a result of the war and the need for special concentration on mining and textiles, the total result is disquieting. Industry will be as deficient of technique as the Government is of policy to meet the storms ahead.

There is one sphere in which the Government appears to be attaining its target and that is in respect to the reduction of real wages. Its White Paper on Personal Incomes issued in February proposed that there should be no general advance in money wages even if prices were increasing. The result is only too obvious. Retail prices have increased by 10 per cent. since June, 1947, while wage rates have only increased by 6 per cent. in the same period. Exact data are not available for all profits, but the 2,348 companies covered by the *Economist* show an increase of profits before tax from £431 million in the year ending June, 1947, to £545 million in June, 1948. In the same period the reserves of the companies increased from £165 million to £292 million. Net profits after tax, depreciation and interest payments rose from £225 million to £268 million, an increase of 19 per cent. The general picture is clear enough. Prices and profits have been rising much faster than wages throughout the year.

The purchasing power of the workers has declined in relation to the stock available. Wholesale stocks of all kinds of clothing in May were slightly more than double those a year previously. There has been a more marked fall in the consumption of less essential consumer goods.

If these trends continue we are likely to have the following results. Foreign raw material prices will continue to rise and this will reflect itself in increased prices of British goods made from them. If the present tendency of wages to lag behind prices continues, there will be an accumulation of goods first in the less essential consumer goods, radios, etc., then in clothes and boots and shoes and household utensils, with the growth of unemployment in the industries concerned. This unemployment will be used by the employers as a means of bringing increased pressure on the employed workers. We do not mean that these trends could result in unemployment on the scale of that experienced in the 1930s, but it could be a sufficiently nasty drag on the advance of the workers and on the recovery of the country.

The way to fight this unemployment is clear. It is for the workers to push wages up to the level of the increased cost of living.

Last March the Conference of Trade Union Executives gave a qualified acceptance to the Government's Wages policy on the ground that it was necessary to restrain wage increases, as part of a wider policy to prevent a raging inflation in which many of the wartime gains of the workers would be swept away. Subsequent events have shown how outrageous this scare was. The danger as we can now see is that the gap between working-class purchasing power and the goods which are being produced will grow and unemployment will result. The Government's wages policy, which is contributing to this result, must be scrapped. Further the increased production of steel makes possible the restoration of some of the capital cuts, and if we want to alleviate the labour shortage the reduction of the armed forces to 500,000 men would release 350,000 workers for industry.

All this is subject to the overriding fact that the factors making for the early outbreak of a crisis in the U.S.A. are piling up. It could explode before the end of the year.

In fighting for a reversal of the present policy of the Government and the T.U.C. we are fighting to strengthen the British working class to meet the impact of this dread event.

TRADE UNION EDUCATION

By DOUGLAS GARMAN

ONE of the most significant post-war developments in the Trade Union Movement, though one which so far has received all too little attention, has been the growth of new forms of educational activity. In 1946 the General Council of the Trades Union Congress instituted a scheme in conjunction with the London School of Economics (L.S.E.) to provide a one-year course of university standard for Trade Unionists, and it has now a similar scheme with Glasgow University. So far some twenty students have passed through the course, admission to which is by scholarships awarded on the basis of a written essay and an interview. Of these scholarships the T.U.C. itself offers six annually; and, though all affiliated Unions have been invited to provide additional scholarships, only the Transport Workers and the Electricians have so far done so; and so far not all of those have been taken up. More students, however, have availed themselves of the other new facility, the series of one month "vocational" courses for training trade union officials, which are organised by the education officers of the T.U.C. at Maritime House in London.

More important, however, from the point of view of numbers, and perhaps also of more immediate value to the movement, is the growing variety of short-term residential schools directly sponsored by individual unions. Noteworthy amongst these are those of the Civil Service Clerical Association, which during the last few years have

provided training for over 6,000 of their members, mostly branch officials; while more recently the Engineers, Miners, Foundry Workers, Agricultural Workers and Railway Clerks Association have all set up residential schools, mainly of a week's duration and open to their members on a scholarship basis. The Fire Brigades Union, which runs similar schools, has also set up an Educational and Research Committee headed by the Union's Assistant General Secretary, working with fourteen district education officers. On a yet more ambitious scale is the proposal of the Electrical Trades Union, endorsed in principle by its last conference but awaiting confirmation by ballot, to provide a wide range of educational facilities for its members; including, what no individual union has so far undertaken, a permanent residential college.

It is in the light of these developments that the T.U.C. General Council's report on education this year will have to be considered. And it should be of especial interest in view of the fact that the National Union of Mineworkers' 1946 Resolution, calling on the General Council to "inaugurate a comprehensive scheme of education in all its spheres" and to "investigate the possibility of arranging a co-ordinated scheme run under centralised control", is due for review. On the basis of this important Resolution, which received the unanimous support of Congress, the General Council has in the meantime approached the two principal bodies concerned with working-class education, the National Council of Labour Colleges (N.C.L.C.) and the Workers' Education Association (W.E.A.) to obtain their views as to the possibility of such a co-ordinated scheme; and undoubtedly the decisions that are taken to implement the Resolution will exert considerable influence on future trends.

Correctly to appraise the new developments referred to above it is necessary to consider not only the conditions which gave rise to them, but also the nature of the problems they set out to tackle. The former are all directly associated with the war, and one of the most important was undoubtedly the rapid numerical growth of the organised movement, particularly of the trade unions. Inevitably this created a demand for increased personnel to fill positions of responsibility and leadership—shop stewards, branch secretaries and full-time officials. Since in many cases this involved the promotion of comparatively new and inexperienced trade unionists, training and education assumed particular importance. Besides the problems confronting the trade unions were often new problems. The responsibility for increasing production, the rapid extension of war-time controls and the participation in them by the workers at all levels from Joint Production Committees to Regional and National Boards, soon made it apparent that, if the trade union representatives were to function effectively, the scope and content of trade union education must be extended. While detailed knowledge of wage agreements and the rule-book, coupled with skill and courage in negotiations, remained as important as ever, there was a growing need for a more profound understanding

of the technical and economic problems not only of one particular industry, but of industry as a whole.

These developments were accompanied by a quickening political tempo due to the sharpening struggle against Fascism. The fact that the main brunt of this struggle was borne by the one country in which the working class had achieved power tremendously strengthened the bonds between the British workers and the Soviet Union, and thus led to a greatly enhanced interest in Socialism and Marxist theory. Similarly, the role of the working class in the Resistance Movements in Europe and Asia, and later the rapid advance of the New Democracies towards Socialism, intensified the militant class consciousness of the British workers, already stimulated by the realisation of the leading part they themselves were playing in the struggle for increased production and the Second Front. And this mood of heightened confidence, which resulted in the election of a majority Labour Government, led in turn to a widespread demand for a fuller understanding of Socialist principles and theory.

This was not, of course, the first time that political development had led to a demand for more adequate working-class education. The W.E.A. was formed in the years when the Labour Party was emerging as an independent political force, just as the most effective development of the N.C.L.C. coincided with the rising militancy of the working class in the years immediately preceding and following the 1914-18 war. And here one cannot help being struck by the comparatively small extent to which these established educational bodies have participated in the new developments we are considering, despite the fact that both the T.U.C. and the individual unions are all affiliated to one or both of them. For though the N.C.L.C. and the W.E.A. have maintained their existing educational services, and though the latter was associated with the schools organised by the Agricultural Workers, Foundrymen and Railway Clerks, the initiative for this new approach has in all cases come from the unions themselves; a fact which indicates that neither the N.C.L.C. nor the W.E.A. is at present fully alive to the educational needs of the movement.

At the same time, however, no one who is conscious of the paramount importance of trade union education in the present situation can be satisfied that these new developments, important and valuable as they are, represent an adequate solution to the problem. In the first place, even with these additions, the education being provided is clearly insufficient in amount; dozens are receiving it where thousands should be. And what is more serious, the lip-service that many trade union leaders pay to the need for education all too often conceals a complacency as to its quality and content—a complacency which the conservatism of the educational organisations themselves is doing little to disturb. Again, the absence of a systematic and co-ordinated approach to the problem of education tends to make the selection and preparation of students altogether too casual. Not only is there little provision to ensure that the rank and file of the move-

ment is keenly and enthusiastically aware of the facilities that exist, but still less are any effective steps taken to retain in the service of the movement those who benefit from education, with the result that scholarships to the London School of Economics or Ruskin College are often regarded rather as stepping-stones to "good jobs" in the commercial world than as the opportunity for specific training for trade union cadres.

But what should arouse the greatest concern throughout the movement is the actual character of the education that is being provided. There is as yet little convincing evidence that the great body of trade unionists realises that education is inevitably one of the principal battle-grounds on which the class struggle has to be fought out. This can be seen in the fact that the T.U.C. has entrusted the carrying out of its most ambitious scheme to the London School of Economics, one of the departments of the London University in which anti-socialist and anti-working-class ideas are today most vehemently propagated; while, at the other extreme, the courses it provides at Maritime House are such as almost to exclude any theoretical training at all. Again, the curriculum for the Diploma at Ruskin College still follows much the same lines as it did before the war, though responsible trade unionists recognise only too well that the problems confronting the movement are in many respects new ones, arising from a new economic and political situation. And even in the recent development of individual trade union schools, though this development is in response to the new situation, there has not yet emerged a *consistent* educational approach appropriate to meet the new educational demands; though it is true that here there are more encouraging signs of experiment and initiative.

The fact is—as indeed more and more workers are coming to realise from the experience of nationalisation under the Labour Government and from the deterioration of the whole political and economic situation during the past two years—that there are only two lines of approach towards meeting the needs of the movement today; the capitalist approach and the working-class approach. At the very root of the weaknesses we have indicated lies the rejection of Marxism by the dominant sections of the trade union and Labour movement; the rejection, that is to say, of the only consistent and scientific theory of the class struggle. Once again it is being demonstrated that the attempt to find an alternative way forward, the so-called "middle way", is in fact a capitulation to the capitalist way. In practice this is being proved by the contradiction between the T.U.C.'s formal endorsement of the Government's wage-freezing policy and the growing demand for wage increases rendered necessary by the exigencies of real life and the vital needs of the workers. It is shown again by the growing and fully justified scepticism of the workers as to the benefits to be received from a form of nationalisation which leaves the capitalist class in unshaken control of the nationalised industries; and in the declarations of Mr. Morrison and others that even this ineffective

form of nationalisation must not be further extended lest it endanger the capitalists' toleration of the Labour Government. And it is revealed even more emphatically as it becomes increasingly clear that this "middle way", of imposing the burdens of the economic crisis on the working class, is inseparable from a foreign policy that combines the subjection of Britain's national interests to American imperialism with growing antagonism to the Soviet Union and the New Democracies.

Precisely the same fact is being demonstrated in the sphere of theory, in education: the fact that here, too, the attempt to follow a "middle way" between education based on the assumptions of capitalism and education rooted in the theory of the class struggle can only lead to education *for* capitalism and *against* socialism. For the educational "middle way" means in practice that the responsibility for education is left in the hands of those who, at the worst, are opposed to Socialism, and who at best, because they reject the class struggle, regard it as the function of trade union education to equip trade unionists as capitalist (and minor capitalist at that) experts. Of course, such education is not lightly to be rejected. It can undoubtedly provide workers with much invaluable information about industry and economics; it can train them in methods of research and familiarise them with the sources of statistical and other factual material that they need in order to pursue their studies; it can provide the opportunity, otherwise lacking, for workers to extend their knowledge of their own rule-book and national wages agreements to the wider fields of trade union law and the history of industrial relations. But education does not consist merely in acquiring knowledge necessary though this is. It also involves relating this knowledge to the achievement of social and political aims. Its function, that is to say, is dynamic, not static: so that, for example, the study of trade unionism not merely requires knowledge of its history and of the *status quo* but must also involve an understanding of the function and purpose of trade unions. And what that understanding is will depend on whether the educators regard trade unions as part of the regulating machinery of capitalist society or as the training ground for the class struggle and for the achievement of Socialism.

In short, the notion that education is a neutral and impartial process, consisting merely in imparting knowledge of "objective" facts, inevitably, in a class divided society, results in confirming the assumptions and the social and political outlook of the dominant class. The only way in which such a result can be counteracted is by ensuring that the spirit and content of education are informed by a conscious understanding of the class struggle, by an understanding of Marxism. To draw from this analysis, however, the conclusion that militant and class conscious workers should hold aloof from the existing facilities for trade union education until and unless they are firmly based on Marxist theory, would be simply to run away from the real problem. On the contrary,

it is precisely to the extent that the most militant and class conscious trade unionists participate in the existing schemes, and seek to develop them further, that they will be able to influence the class content of working-class education and to demonstrate the necessity for Marxism. In so doing they will find that within the existing educational bodies—not only the N.C.L.C. and the W.E.A., but also the Universities—there is a growing recognition of the tremendous contribution that Marxism has made, and is increasingly making, to modern thought, and a growing readiness to include the study of Marxist theory in the curriculum of working-class education. In this respect especially the new educational developments that are taking place can exert an important progressive influence, for these developments are the result of direct initiative by trade unions themselves in response to the ever more clearly defined class needs of their membership.

WAR COMES TO MALAYA

By H. B. LIM

SCARCELY three years after their struggle against Fascist Japan, the people of Malaya have been plunged into another war. The British Army, Navy, Air Force, Gurkhas, Dyak head-hunters, Alsatian dogs and Palestine Police, have been mobilised to kill trade unionists and other democrats in Malaya.

The Colonial Office has thought out a “Communist Plot” as the reason for starting the war. This is nothing unusual in this era of M-Protocols and similar forgeries of this kind. It has become a matter of routine for such manufactured plots to precede bombs. Malaya itself has experienced similar “plots” since the end of the war. Each time, a fresh wave of terror was let loose upon the people. What is far more important is, there is a genuine and a very serious Malayan plot. It is the plot to subjugate the 5½ million people of Malaya by subterfuge and by force, a plot directed from Whitehall and carried out by a son of Ramsay MacDonald.

When the Japanese invaders strolled into Malaya in 1941-42, the entire civilian population were left at the mercy of the invaders. British imperial policy would not permit the local population to defend themselves. Undaunted, the Malayan people themselves organised underground resistance against the Japanese, losing heavily at first, but gaining sufficient experience and foresight to achieve the formation of the Malayan Peoples’ Anti-Japanese Army. It was the MPAJA and its widespread Resistance groups which led the guerilla fighting against the Japanese and ensured the handing over of the country to the British without the latter having to fire a shot.

The MPAJA were given formal recognition of their work—being decorated by Lord Mountbatten and given a place of honour in the Victory Parade in London. Popular acclamation also compelled

the Government to grant representation to the Communist Party—leaders of the Resistance—the Trade Unions, the Youth League and the Women's Federation. They were given seats in the first post-war Advisory Councils.

Once the period of judicious appeasement was over, the Government started a wave of persecution against these organisations, arresting some, and banishing others, among the latter members of the Council. The official reason for this action was that the persons concerned were "agitators". The truth was, they saw through the sham promises of the White Paper too early for the Government's liking. The Government had planned to build up its own sponsored trade unions to replace the existing unions organised by the people themselves. To that end, trade union "advisers", whose bluster and conceit exceeded even their ignorance of trade unionism, were imported to advise the peoples' unions to surrender their freedom to the Government or face outlawry. Instead of yielding to intimidation, the trade unions hardened and gained strength. They soon matured into the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, numbering 300,000 Malay, Indian and Chinese workers. The PMFTU was given recognition by the World Federation of Trade Unions. This made no difference, in the words of the Government, to the "requirements of the local legislation" which forbade the use of trade union funds for political purposes, and conferred discretionary powers on the Registrar of trade unions in all matters affecting the registration and internal administration of the unions.

Despite such severe restrictions, the affiliates of the PMFTU agreed to register and were accepted after several months of legalistic fencing. Nevertheless, the persecution of trade unionists went on. The Government, with whom were ranged the big employers, could not solve the fundamental problem of rising costs and low wages. Rations were one-third of the 1940 figure, and at a cost of \$2.40 (5s. 7d.) against the full-ration cost of \$1.40 (3s. 3d.) in 1940. The remaining two-thirds of the rations could only be bought at the black-market at a cost of \$11.20 (25s. 8d.). To secure his normal diet, therefore, the worker had to spend nine times as much as in 1940, though money wages in no case rose beyond double the pre-war figure. The official policy towards this problem was frankly stated by one of the trade union advisers: "If wages rose, it would become uneconomical to run estates, which would cease working, thus leading to a labour surplus". This is the sort of pseudo-academic rubbish which the Malayan workers were expected to swallow with their meagre rations.

Strikes swept the country—over 3,000 in 1946 alone. The Government's answer was more terror, and finally the banning of the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions on June 13 of this year.

From mid-1946 to the end of 1947, the Government was also busy devising new methods to quell the popular demand for a democratic constitution. The demand reached its height when the demo-

cratic parties in the country, representing some 600,000 Malays, Indians and Chinese, formed a United Front to prevent the imposition of Colonial rule and to put forward counter-proposals for at least the basis of a democratic constitution. The Government hedged and threatened. It was looking around for amiable puppets who were prepared to serve as the pall-bearers of the Government's new constitution. These were found among the Malay feudal chieftains, and isolated groups of Chinese, Indian and Eurasian individuals whose narrow interests were irretrievably bound up with the preservation of imperialist rule.

Amid this unwholesome atmosphere the new "Federal Constitution" was promulgated—devoid of democratic features. There was no franchise—all the 61 unofficial members and the 14 official members being nominated by the High Commissioner.

Singapore remained separate and, more openly, as a Crown Colony with a feeble attempt to simulate democracy by allowing six out of the 22 Legislative Councillors to be elected. At any rate, only British subjects could vote, and nominated and elected members alike were swamped by the Governor's Veto and formidable list of Reserved Powers.

The United Front boycotted this fake constitution and as early as October, 1947, led a 24-hour protest general strike, which paralysed the whole country. By the beginning of this year it had become apparent that the Government could no longer sustain the task of pretending to be democratic, so discussions began as to the most decisive method of smashing all opposition.

Only one more preliminary step was needed by the Government before it unleashed the brutalities of war upon the people. It was a twofold procedure; (a) intensive propaganda against the democratic forces and (b) legislation to prepare the ground for the speedy defeat of the democratic forces in the military action that was to follow. The propaganda was as slanderous as it was crude. It took the form of indiscriminate branding of members of the United Front as bandits and murderers and agitators. It also made use of the universally discredited Foreign Office "Communist Plot" to conceal the military schemes of the Colonial Office.

More immediate damage was inflicted on the Malayan people by the legislative weapon. Emergency regulations were rushed through the puppet Councils, in some cases within 12 hours, empowering the Government to conduct mass arrests on suspicion; to withhold normal trials; to seize newspapers, premises, vehicles and vessels; to restrict personal meetings; to prohibit the printing, sale and circulation of any document that has a "seditious tendency"; and to disperse any meeting, indoor or outdoor, of five persons or more.

Ten days after the PMFTU was banned, the ex-Service Association of the MPAJA, the Communist Party, the New Democratic Youth League and the Malay Youth Organisation (PETA) were banned.

These formalities of banning came after many members of the organisations had been arrested, imprisoned, or killed; so that, in point of fact, the war on the Malaysians started before the alleged state of emergency existed. Within two months, over 3,000 persons have been arrested, several killed, including Liew Yau, one of the Regimental commanders of the MPAJA who attended the Victory Parade in London. Several villages throughout the country have been subjected to bombing and rocket fire by the RAF, so that women and children are killed as part of the terror campaign.

The people of Malaya have been compelled to take up arms to defend themselves. Their entire existence has been challenged. They have responded to the challenge with a Peoples' Liberation Army, and a Liberation movement that will not end until the imperialist rule of exploitation and terror is removed from their homeland. This, then, is the "banditry" which professional liars are telling decent British parents they must send their sons to fight. It is for this criminal venture that unsuspecting dockers in Britain are being used to ship guns and armoured cars.

The last desperate gamble of British imperialism is not confined to Malaya; nor will it end there. The Malayan campaign is part of the joint imperialist strategy to wrest freedom from the free peoples of China, Viet-Nam, Malaya, Burma, India and Indonesia. Malaya has been chosen as the spring-board of the imperialist attack because of its rich rubber and tin and its strategic position in relation to the rest of S.E. Asia. The war in Malaya is therefore also part of the re-orientation of strategy by the imperialist powers who, having failed in their policy of armed intimidation elsewhere, are making their thrust against what they hope would be the softer parts of the globe.

The immediate problem arising out of the Malaya situation is not whether the Peoples' Liberation movement will survive and succeed. Of this there is no doubt; for the confidence and ability of the free peoples of Asia is commensurate with their love of freedom. The bigger problem is one which confronts the whole world, and which poses the urgent question: will the peace-loving peoples of the world allow themselves to be involved into another war in blind obedience to the dog-whistle of an armed gang of planters, mine-owners, entrepreneurs, and their unemployed friends from the Palestine Police Force? If dumb Alsatian dogs and pitifully barbaric Dyak head-hunters have responded they at least sin in innocence.

Articles on the struggle for peace which have appeared in 1948 include:

- "Breakdown of the London Conference," by Quæstor (Jan.).
- "Save Peace—Save Britain," by R.P.D. (April).
- "Mad as a March Seare," by Ivor Montagu (April).
- "May Day and the Fight for Peace," by R.P.D. (May).
- "Green Light For War—Nine Years Ago," by Quæstor (May and June).
- "Behind The Dollar Curtain," by American readers (July).
- "Desion For Peace," by Leah Manning, M.P. (July).
- "The War Danger," by William Rust (July).
- "End The Cold War," by Henry Wallace (August).
- "Germany—The Storm Centre," by J. Winternitz (August).

MARX ON DICTATORSHIP

Leaving Vienna, Marx in the second week of September reached Berlin where he continued his negotiations with the leaders of the democratic movement and came to an agreement with Koscielsky, the head of the Polish democratic "Emigration", who a week later sent 2,000 thaler to Marx for the Gazette. Back in Cologne on 12th September Marx immediately dealt with the governmental crisis and recalled, in articles of which excerpts are given below, Camphausen's short-lived Liberal ministry of March 29 to June 25, 1848.

By the end of September threats of police persecution had compelled Engels and three other members of the staff of the Gazette to leave Cologne.

THE CRISIS.

We are moving towards a decisive struggle. The simultaneous crises in Frankfurt and Berlin, the latest decisions of the two Assemblies, force the counter-revolution to fight its last battle. If they dare in Berlin to trample underfoot the constitutional principle of the rule of the majority, if the 209 votes of the majority are opposed by twice that number of cannon, if it is dared to mock the majority not only in Berlin but also in Frankfurt by a Ministry that is impossible in relation to the two Assemblies—if thus civil war is provoked between Prussia and Germany, then the democrats will know what they have to do.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung, September 12, 1848.

Every provisional situation of the State after a revolution requires a dictatorship, and indeed an energetic dictatorship. From the beginning we reproached Camphausen because he did not act dictatorially, because he did not at once smash and remove the remnants of the old institutions. Thus, while Herr Camphausen lulled himself in constitutional dreaming, the defeated Party strengthened its positions in the bureaucracy and army, and here and there even ventured an open struggle. The Assembly was convened to come to an agreement on the Constitution. It took its place as with equal rights alongside the Crown. Two powers with equal rights in a provisional period! It was precisely the division of powers by means of which Herr Camphausen sought "to save freedom", it was precisely this division of powers that in a provisional period was bound to lead to collisions. Behind the throne lurked the counter-revolutionary camarilla of the nobility, military and bureaucracy. Behind the majority of the Assembly stood the bourgeoisie. The Ministry tried to mediate. Too weak to represent in a determined way the interests of the bourgeoisie and peasants, or to overthrow at one blow the power of the nobility, bureaucracy and army leaders, too clumsy not to wound the bourgeoisie everywhere in its financial measures, it achieved nothing but to make itself impossible for all Parties and to bring about the collision which it was precisely its desire to avoid.

Neue Rheinische Zeitung, September 14, 1848.

Book Reviews

From the Treasury of Marxism

In Defence of Materialism by G. V. Plekhanov, translated by Andrew Rothstein (Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, 18s).

At last an important gap in the collection of classical expositions of Marxism available to the English reader has been filled. Until now only two or three of the shorter of Plekhanov's Marxist studies were obtainable in translation, such as his 'Essays in the History of Materialism' and his study of 'The Role of the Individual in History'. Now at last we have an excellent edition of Plekhanov's chief Marxist work, the book that Lenin said served to "rear a whole generation of Russian Marxists".

Plekhanov was the forerunner of Lenin. The importance of his role can be judged from the statement in the "Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" that "his works cleared the way for the victory of Marxism in Russia". Starting as a supporter of the main revolutionary movement in the 'seventies—the Narodniks or "Friends of the People"—he quickly found his way to Marxism, especially after being forced into exile abroad. In 1882 he made the first translation into Russian of the Communist Manifesto, in 1883 he founded the first Russian organisation for spreading Marxism, and thereafter for twenty years he devoted himself to brilliantly defending Marxism against its enemies in Russia. True, after 1903 he wavered and fell back, but by then the torch of Marxism was firmly in the hands of Lenin, who could still write in 1914, after all his criticism of Plekhanov, that "The best exposition of the philosophy of Marxism and of historical materialism is given by G. V. Plekhanov".

These and similar tributes from outstanding Russian Marxists suffice to indicate the permanent value of

Plekhanov's work, a value which is not confined to its historic role in the early struggle for the victory of Marxist ideas in Russia.

Yet the book under review bears very strongly the impress of the historical circumstances in which it came into being. It was written in 1894 and the practical issue that underlay it was the question of capitalist development in Russia. Just when it was becoming clear that capitalism was rapidly taking hold of Russian economy, the Narodniks—who believed that capitalism was an alien product of the West and would not develop in Russia—launched furious attacks on the pioneer Russian Marxists. Plekhanov took up the cudgels on behalf of Marxism, exposing the bankruptcy of the Narodniks and at the same time giving a brilliant exposition and defence of dialectical materialism. The viewpoint which he defended was still relatively unknown in Russia and he successfully performed the task of equipping the young generation of Russian social democrats with the world outlook of Marxism as against the old Narodnik views.

It is interesting to note that the whole book was written in London. Plekhanov succeeded in having it published legally in Russia in 1895 under a pseudonym. To defeat the dull-witted censorship he gave it the long academic-sounding title "On the Question of the Development of the Monist View of History", to act as "a lightning conductor" as he said himself in a preface written in 1914. In character, the book is sharply polemical, directed especially against the subjective, idealist views of his Narodnik opponent Mikhailovsky.

In this respect Plekhanov follows the examples of the founders of Marxism, pursuing Mikhailovsky as systematically and relentlessly as ever Engels pursued Durhring. He never, however, loses sight of his main object, which is to analyse and reveal the shortcomings of the philosophers before Marx and to explain how Marx based himself on them and went beyond them.

Thus, Plekhanov opens his book

with three chapters on the French forerunners of Marx. Firstly, he deals with the 18th century French materialists and the defects of their materialism, especially in relation to human history. The second chapter reviews the advance made by the French Restoration historians, such as Guizot, whose experience of class struggle made them attempt to explain politics and human history in the light of the property relations of the given epoch. This survey is of additional interest because the contention has been advanced in this country that Guizot "anticipated" Marx. The third chapter deals with the French Utopian socialists. The next stage is seen in the long chapter devoted to idealist German philosophy, which culminated in the dialectical idealism of Hegel.

This is followed by the longest chapter of all, devoted to "modern materialism". Here Plekhanov gives his main exposition of dialectical materialism, especially in its application to particular questions of history, law, science and art. Thus he deals brilliantly with such vexed problems as the relation between the productive forces and human institutions, the influence of environment on nations, the development of ideologies and the role of the individual. Finally, in a concluding chapter Plekhanov comes back to the key question of the practical controversy with the Narodniks, their arguments as to whether capitalism was "inevitable" in Russia. In the course of shattering their arguments, Plekhanov deals with the future of the Russian village commune and draws a parallel with the German utopians who opposed Marx on similar grounds in the forties and exposes the futility of the Narodnik "ideals" in comparison with reality.

All this controversy played a weighty role in the development of Marxist cadres in Russia. For us it cannot play the same vital role, for it is not part of our immediate past. But, as in the case of Durhring, Plekhanov's opponents continually reproduce the same errors, the same distortions and "refutations" of

Marxism, that crop up again and again today. Hence, Plekhanov's skilful treatment of these ever-recurrent themes is still immensely valuable to us and his sharp logic and clear argument give him his place among the classics. Incidentally, Plekhanov, like Lenin, did not merely accept what Marx had written. Like Lenin, he studied and worked over all the originals, including Hegel.

This is not to say that Plekhanov's theoretical exposition has no defects. Lenin, in his fragment "On Dialectics", written in 1914, noted Plekhanov's lack of attention to the struggle of mutually exclusive opposites as perhaps the fundamental aspect of dialectics. A further development of this criticism of Lenin's can be found in Andrew Rothstein's superb introduction to the present book. In 20 pages he gives a review of Plekhanov's life and an estimate of his work which is obviously the fruit of much original research. It is a worthy preface to a fine translation in crisp, readable English. At the same time, a careful check with the original shows that the translation is scrupulously accurate.

It has taken over half a century for this work to appear in the country in which it was originally written. Now, when all sorts of idealist philosophies and refutations of Marx are still the fashion in Britain, Plekhanov's book is still a valuable, up-to-date weapon in the armoury of Marxists.

CLEMENS DUTT.

American Way of Life

One Thousand Americans, by George Seldes (Boni and Gaer, N.Y.C., 18/-).

MR. SELDES, famous in the U.S.A. for his ruthless collecting and marshalling of inconvenient facts derived from official sources, has written under the above title a formidably-documented exposure of the thousand-odd people who rule the U.S.A., and of the methods by which they rule it.

Mr. Seldes displays a great volume of facts, of first-class importance, demonstrating the vast power, selfish-

ness, and lack of scruple shown by the American ruling class, all of which has been published in official publications of Congress or Government, and all of which has failed almost wholly of effect simply because the Press has suppressed it. Many people on both sides of the Atlantic are unable or unwilling to believe that mere newspaper misrepresentation or suppression can keep substantially the whole of a nation in ignorance of vital and exciting facts which are reported in Government publications available to all purchasers at a moderate price; but it is unfortunately true, and this book gives many examples of the deadly effects of its truth. It gives, too, an interesting account of the way in which the ruthless "big boys" achieved step by step the position that they need scarcely worry what Congress Committees may report, since the report will not reach the general public.

The daily and weekly Press was first gradually bought up; and then later the magazines—which remained free longer—were put through the same process. There remains now, in the great free Press of the great free country, scarcely a periodical of any size which does not exercise to the full the freedom to omit, distort, or deny everything its free owners wish to have omitted, distorted, or denied. It is terrifying to think that the American public, living in a country of great material power and in theory ruling it, should have to select its President, Senators and Representatives, and to make up its mind on such issues as that of the U.S.S.R., with no general source of

information other than a Press which lives under such concentrated one-outlook ownership, and exercises with such thoroughness the art of concealing the facts. It is, as Seldes says, impossible for the American public to know the facts or to form true judgments.

The book is even more important for the information it gives as to the habits and activities of the rulers of America. We get from it an even more vivid picture than most of us have had before of the way in which Big Business held the Government to ransom in the early stages of World War II—"No price is too high when honour and freedom are at stake"—and at the same time sought to favour its German cartel brothers.

One particular point that comes up in the book is the information—new, I think, to most of us—that about the time Roosevelt came to power and began the New Deal, a proposed fascist coup d'état, aimed at seizing power in Washington, was at any rate carried so far that it was dealt with officially in Report No. 153 of the House of Representatives in the 74th Congress of the U.S., in 1935. (As an interesting contrast, there is a very interesting "Orientation Fact Sheet" of the U.S. War Department, dated 24th March, 1945, one of a series intended to form the basis for weekly discussions in the Army. It is so good that it might well be copied and used here and elsewhere. But it was also so good that American reactionaries—including Hearst, Rankin, and one of Father Coughlin's lawyers—directed such a formidable fire against it that they managed not merely to have

Trade unionists who may be delegates to conferences or preparing annual reports should note these articles on wages and workshop issues in LABOUR MONTHLY in 1948:

- "Deflation and the Economic Crisis," by Maurice Dobb (Jan.).
- "Trade Unions and Communism," by Arthur Horner (Feb.); also as a 3d. pamphlet.
- "The Offensive Against Labour Unity," by Harry Adams (April).
- "Guns or Butter," by J. R. Campbell (May).
- "Strings or Chains?" by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. (June).
- "Caste System in Britain," by P. H. H. Bryan (June).
- "Two Impressions of Scarborough," by Steve Lawther and Tom Gittins (July).
- "The Wage Freeze," by Jim Gardner (July).

Some are still available; but to ensure not missing such important contributions, readers should order regularly through newsagents or take out subscriptions (1s. yearly, 13s. overseas); post free from 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

that particular week's "Fact Sheet" suppressed but to have the whole series stopped!)

What are the morals for us to draw? First, no doubt, to read this book and quote it everywhere. More generally:

1) to remember that it can, and does, "happen here", and to redouble our vigilance and activity against the concentration of press and other power, and against press misrepresentation.

2) to try to make our supposedly naïve Government realise that the "great generosity of the American people" to which we are asked to pay tribute is in fact that degree of generosity which is permitted—and practised—by the particularly ruthless ruling class described in this book;

3) to wonder whether the commentator who said that when Fascism comes to the U.S.A. it will be called "Anti-Fascism" was either correct, or nearly so discerning as he seemed. If one studies the book soberly, one is forced to conclude that Fascism, whilst it is arriving, is called "Freedom", "Western Democracy", and "The American Way of Life".

D. N. PRITT.

The Nazis Went, the Monopolies Stayed

Lehren Deutscher Geschichte by A. Norden (Dietz, Berlin).

U.S.A. monopolies had a dominating influence in about 60 big German enterprises which played a decisive part in the Nazi armament drive. The Opel Motor Works near Frankfurt, which changed over from motor cars to tank production, belonged to General Motors. The Ford Works in Cologne, also efficient in supplies of tanks and armoured cars, miraculously survived all the heavy bombings. 30% of the stock of the A.E.G. (the German Electrical Trust) belonged to General Electric, 40% of the German production of telegraph and telephone apparatus were controlled by the International Telegraph and Telephone Company, associated with the House of Morgan.

In 1937 two Nazi representatives—one of these was von Killinger, the murderer of the Catholic minister Erzberger—had secret negotiations with representatives of U.S.A. Big Business on co-operation against the danger of "Sovietisation" and the sharing out of markets. American representatives were: Senator Vandenberg, Lamont du Pont, director of the American chemical trust which had the closest relations to the German Dye Trust, and A. P. Sloan, President of General Motors.

When Omgus, American Mil. Gov., was established in Germany in 1945, General Draper was appointed as chief of the economic department. Draper was vice-president of Dillon, Read & Co., a bank which was only second to Morgan in supplying credits to Germany. One of his subordinates in the control of German economy was P. S. Hoglund, before the war one of the directors of the Opel factory near Frankfurt. No wonder that the Nazi directors of Opel were let off by the de-nazification Court with a fine of 2,000 marks while a leading Communist, Hamman, who had demanded the de-nazification of the Opel directorate, was arrested by the Americans and spent 14 months in Dachau!

These are some of the facts revealed in a book, "*Lehren Deutscher Geschichte*" (Lessons of German History), recently published by Dietz in Berlin. The author, A. Norden, continues with his historical survey of the role of German monopolies from the Kaiser up to the present time; useful work begun in 1939 when, under a pseudonym, he wrote "*The Real Rulers of Germany*", published in Paris and translated into French, English and other languages.

In a time when new attempts are made to exculpate the German monopolists by laying all the blame for the Nazi crimes on Hitler and his cronies exclusively, and when the industrial and financial backers of the Nazi régime return to power with the help of their old American and British business partners, an English edition of this book full of revealing facts as those quoted above would be highly desirable.

J. W.

History in the Making

A Companion to Study.

GENERAL EDITOR: DONA TORR

A supplement to existing social and political histories drawn from contemporary sources, memoirs, Trade Union records, evidence before Royal Commissions and other rich material in which our history abounds.



*Publication:
August 26th.*

Volume II: 1849-1879

Labour's Formative Years

Edited with an Introduction

By JAMES B. JEFFERYS



Still Available.

Volume I: 1815-1848

From Cobbett to the Chartists

Edited with an Introduction

By MAX MORRIS



Forthcoming.

Volume III: 1880-1900

Labour's Turning Point

Edited with an Introduction

By ERIC HOBSBAWN

Price 5s. each

Lawrence & Wishart

JEWS WITHOUT MONEY

By Michael Gold.

A powerful picture from the pen of one of America's most brilliant writers, this life of a young Jew in the slums of New York will echo in the heart of every transplanted member of the Jewish people, as well as any other reader. With untrimmed speech, the authors—tailors, gangster and prostitutes—reflect the despairing effort of the Jewish spirit to survive the degradation of American Slumdom.

A tragic and yet humorous story, this reprint of a book first published 18 years ago, is the tale of ancient Israel struggling in the underworld of the most modern city. Today more timely than ever. Full cloth 10s. 6d.

RITA SEARL

Bookseller and Publisher,

**172 HIGHAM HILL ROAD,
LONDON, E.17**

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

NAME
(Please use Block Capitals)

ADDRESS
.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber to LABOUR MONTHLY and enclose 12/- (Home)

_____ to cover 12 months' 13/- (Abroad) subscription beginning with the

.....issue.
(Strike out the words which do not apply)

Signed

Date
Air Mail Rates according to destination.

club" of farm women out on the prairies, saying "One woman walks six miles to it with her baby each fortnight"

THAT BROADCAST.

Many have written about the Third Programme broadcast in July by the Editor, Mr. R. Palme Dutt, in a discussion which closed the series "The Soviet Idea", and have asked when it would appear in *The Listener*. The short answer is that there will be a repeat broadcast in the Home Programme on September 7 at 10 p.m. That will be your last chance, because the B.B.C., having published the other six talks in *The Listener*, propose not to print the discussion in which Mr. Dutt, the only Marxist speaker in the series, took part. They hold the view, I understand, that it is "too long" and that discussions "do not read well". Quite a few who were fortunate enough to hear the Third Programme broadcast sent us donations on the strength of it.

AIRMAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Occasionally we get inquiries from abroad about airmail subscriptions. At 3s. postage per copy, these amount to £2 8s a year for India; \$10.00 for Canada and U.S.A. to mention the main ones.

DID YOU MISS THESE?

When specially interesting articles appear, readers often write to ask what has appeared in recent issues on the same subject. To save postage at both ends, we give on pages 283 and 287 a list of articles on Wages and Workshop issues; and on the struggle for peace.

If you search an Index of the LABOUR MONTHLY through its 27 years, you will not find so many articles with the title "Education". But every issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY is itself a study course in a fighting working-class education—the theory and practice of Marxism.

"MY HOLIDAY MONEY".

Holidays always tend to hamper the fund. But there are exceptions. One reader writes from Glasgow: "Not fulfilling my guarantee of 2/6 a month has definitely disturbed my peace of mind. So please accept the enclosed £1 deducted from my holiday money!" We wish him a very good holiday—in perfect peace. The July total was:

£31 6s. 9d.

Regular donations came from:—

B.B. (O.A.P.), 1s; L. Rowan, 6s; Royston Green, 3s 3d; Anon., Whitechurch, 1s; W. F. Lakin-Smith, 2s 6d; H.S.M., 2s 6d; D. M. Clarke, 10s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 10s; T.W.R., £1; H. N. Humphreys, 3s 6d; R.F.B., £3; Mrs. K. Kennedy, 2s 6d; L'Humanité, 2s; S. Mill, 10s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; J.B., Chelmsford, 10s; F. Wedlake, 2s 6d; Olivia Greene, £2; P. J. Davis, 2s 6d; F. Renouf, 5s; S. Morrissey, 10s; Director, £2; Socialist Sailor, £1; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d.

Other contributions include:—

Mrs. A. French, 8s; J. R. Lloyd, 3s; C. Huntley, 2s; J. J. Murphy, 8s; H. Loshak, 8s; J. H. Wolstencroft, 3s; L. Bates, 5s; A. A. Wills, 3s; D. H. Stiles, 3s; G. S. Hodgins, 8s; Cmdr. E. P. Young, 8s; J. S. Houston, £1; E. Walton, 8s; W. H. Turner, 3s; Dr. L. Naftali, 8s; C. Miller, 1s; C. Macirone, £1; W. Breach, 8s; Miss S. D. Murch, 1s 10d; D. K. Plinn, 10s; A. W. Kingsley, 8s; T. M. O. Lane, 8s; J. Peterson, 8s; Two Marxists, 10s; O. Pond, 4s; T. Chapman, 1s 6d; A. Hampton, 3s; D. Goldring, 8s; Miss H. E. Hope, 3s; R. D. Manning, 8s; J. Pinder, 3s; P.B.C., 1s; C. Sharpe, 5s; N. Cluett, 1s 6d; Wm. Charters, 3s; M. Milligan, 8s; D. Gardner, 3s; A. Sykes, 3s; J. Clement, 5s; W. Graham, 5s; J. Skelley, 3s; C. Wyndham, 2s 6d; G. M. Harrison, £2 10s; G. J. Harrison, 5s; K. C. Stubbs, 10s; A.W. (U.S.A.), £1 3s 9d; "For my stepson," 9s 8d (2 dollars).

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain